ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/13/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED001999	N.A.	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Winick, Charles

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Trends in Human Relations Research

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York 16, New York

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue New York, New York

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	1955	48

ORG. of B'nai B'rith, 315
ST. Lexington Avenue
CITY, STATE New York 16, New York
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☒
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Trend Study

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

social science		human relations	
psychological factors	behavioral science	research	
intergroup relations	prejudicial attitudes	Sigmund Livingston	
intergroup research	sociological factors	fellowships	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A review of main trends in recent human relations research in the United States, particularly as illustrated in the work of Sigmund Livingston Fellows, is presented. The focus is on studies dealing with ethnic, racial, or religious categories, and on research dealing with intergroup prejudice and discrimination. The three major trends in research in recent years are: important advances in research design and methods; increased attention to the fundamental relations between prejudice and personality characteristics; and new approaches to the study of cultural, institutional, and group variables in intergroup attitudes and behavior.

Main areas of discussion include: Research on Human Relations and the Sigmund Livingston Program; The Historical Background; Advances in Research Design; Psychological Interpretations of Prejudice as a Function of Personality; Studies of the Group, Cultural, and Institutional Nexus of Intergroup Behavior; Research on Group Relations and the Livingston Fellowship.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

DESEGREGATION & INTERGROUP RELATIONS
RESEARCH (COMPILATIONS & DIGESTS

ED001933

Trends in Human Relations Research

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Anna Holden Winick

TRENDS IN HUMAN RELATIONS RESEARCH

THE SIGMUND LIVINGSTON FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

by **CHARLES WINICK**
in collaboration with
GILBERT SHAPIRO

preface by
ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
Director, Social Science Research Center
Cornell University

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

Bennett O. Stalvey

Copyright—1955. ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Officers: HENRY EDWARD SCHULTZ, *national chairman;* MEIER STEINBRINK, *honorary chairman;* BARNEY BALABAN, A. G. BALLENGER, A. K. COHEN, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, LEON LOWENSTEIN, BENJAMIN SAMUELS, MELVIN H. SCHLESINGER, JESSE STEINHART, *honorary vice-chairmen;* DAVID COLEMAN, HENRY EPSTEIN, DAVID A. ROSE, *vice-chairmen;* JACOB ALSON, *treasurer;* BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN, *secretary and national director;* BERNARD NATH, *chairman, executive committee;* PAUL SAMPLINER, *vice-chairman;* HENRY EPSTEIN, *chairman, national program committee;* HAROLD LACHMAN, *chairman, national education and research committee;* OSCAR COHEN, *national program director;* OSCAR TARCOV, *publication director.*

Table of Contents

		Page
	PREFACE	5
I.	RESEARCH ON HUMAN RELATIONS AND THE SIGMUND LIVINGSTON PROGRAM	9
II.	THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	11
III.	ADVANCES IN RESEARCH DESIGN	18
IV.	PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF PREJUDICE AS A FUNCTION OF PERSONALITY	24
V.	STUDIES OF THE GROUP, CULTURAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL NEXUS OF INTERGROUP BEHAVIOR	30
VI.	RESEARCH ON GROUP RELATIONS: WHITHER NOW?	37
VII.	THE LIVINGSTON FELLOWSHIPS	42
	a. BY SUBJECT	
	b. THE LIVINGSTON FELLOWS	
	c. THE SIGMUND LIVINGSTON MEMORIAL FUND	
VIII.	INDEX	47

BLANK PAGE

Preface

In the vital, rapidly changing, and somewhat chaotic field of research on intergroup relations, experience has shown the great value of periodic inventories and appraisals. The practical urgency of increased knowledge in this field is widely sensed nowadays. What is not always so clearly or easily seen is the double fact of the special difficulties of scientific research on these problems, along with the quite impressive progress of recent years in accumulating a solid base of empirical findings, and of increased sophistication in methods and theory.

In the pages which follow, Winick and Shapiro provide us with a lucid and well-balanced review of main trends in recent "human relations" research in the United States, particularly as illustrated in the work of Sigmund Livingston Fellows. Their special focus of interest is, properly enough, on studies that have dealt with ethnic, racial, or religious categories. They are thus obliged to pay special attention to research on intergroup prejudice and discrimination. At the same time, the authors show with unusual clarity that such research attains its full usefulness only when it is directly linked to the more general and basic advance of knowledge about human social behavior in other aspects.

The record of the Sigmund Livingston Fellowship Program is shown to give convincing evidence of the widening horizons of intergroup research. We can well agree with the authors that the support of basic research in many of the studies made under this program ". . . reflects a full realization of the interdependence of social life, a sophisticated respect for fundamental science, and sufficient vision to seek the long-run reward which bodes well for the future of intergroup research."

Perhaps it should be emphasized that the "respect for fundamental science" shown in this report is one which judiciously points to the limitations and weaknesses of present-day social science while giving full recognition to achievements and potentialities. Research on intergroup relations has suffered no less from the over-enthusiasm of those who saw in research a new magic formula for the solution of social ills than from those who were excessively skeptical of all

scientific approaches. It is therefore especially welcome to find a clear, thoughtful evaluation of the successes and failures of the brief history of intergroup research.

The authors examine the studies conducted under the Sigmund Livingston program and compare them with research patterns of earlier periods. They conclude that in the field as a whole the foci of attention have shifted from the very earliest preoccupation with alleged racial differences in physical and psychological characteristics to an emphasis on descriptive studies of intergroup stereotypes and attitudes, and then in turn to a more complex orientation which includes a wide range of both psychological and sociological factors.

In the years since World War II, they point to three major trends in research: (1) important advances in research design and methods; (2) increased attention to the functional relations between prejudice and personality characteristics; (3) new approaches to the study of cultural, institutional, and group variables in intergroup attitudes and behavior.

Perhaps the most challenging conclusion from this analysis of the newer developments is that the greatly improved understandings deriving from recent research have yet to be put together so as to specifically connect the "psychological" and the "sociological" findings. The service of the present monograph is to pose this crucial problem in sharp outline against a background of illustrations drawn from specific studies. It seems clear that both the needs of social science and of social practice require that we push forward with decisive research on the interrelations of "personality" and "social context," as these affect intergroup orientations and behavior.

A particularly valuable feature of the report is its detailed documentation of the way in which research on intergroup relations is increasingly permeated with developments from the larger body of systematic behavioral science. The other side of the picture also clearly appears: the growing relevance of such research to basic knowledge of the antecedent and consequent relations of factors affecting behavior in defined contexts. This is not to say that "intergroup relations" is about to disappear as a special field of study. Its problems are too close to the central social issues of our day to permit any such disappearance; and there are sound, scientific reasons for maintaining intergroup behavior as a distinct focus of research effort.

What does seem to be happening is that the earlier research is now correctly seen as both overly descriptive-concrete and unduly provincial in its grasp of fundamental theory. It is no longer enough to know a mass of facts, or to "measure attitudes," or to describe race conflict. Implicit in Winick and Shapiro's discussion, therefore, is recognition of the more demanding standards against which we now judge research in this field.

Both intergroup practitioners and research specialists will find many stimuli to provocative thinking in what might best be called "an agenda of unanswered questions." And, as the authors suggest, it is possible that useful answers will come sooner and more adequately if the practitioners and the research people cross their own intergroup barriers in order to work constructively with their opposite numbers in seeking the new knowledge so urgently called for by the nature of 20th century human living.

In a report of such compactness, it is inevitable that some statements will lack all the qualifications and disclaimers which some readers will wish to see. But it can be said safely that in its broad strokes this brief monograph will repay the careful reading of anyone searching for increased understanding of its subject matter.

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
August 15, 1955.

BLANK PAGE

CHAPTER I

Research on Human Relations and The Sigmund Livingston Program

It is generally agreed that man's inability better to order his relations with his fellow men has caused most of the problems which beset civilization today. The basic problem of how the good society can be achieved has enlisted the services of statesmen on all levels.

Statesmen are not the only ones seeking solutions to the problems which arise when groups live together. Social scientists have been studying the basic dynamics of living together for some time, in order to determine what kinds of meaningful generalizations can be made about human social behavior. Slowly and laboriously, social science has been trying to develop some knowledge of the elements of human behavior and adaptation and about the causes and results of different behaviors. But our knowledge has not kept pace with our aspirations in this field, and much more research is needed.

Aware of the need for more research in the behavior sciences, a group of friends of Sigmund Livingston in 1947 established the Sigmund Livingston Fellowships for study and research in the human relations field. The purpose of the Fellowships was to honor the memory of Sigmund Livingston by advancing knowledge in the field of group relations. Sigmund Livingston, founder in 1913 of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, could have had no more appropriate memorial.

The fellowships have so far been made available to forty-two outstanding graduate and post-graduate students of the behavior sciences. Persons receiving a fellowship could work on any problem they chose. The Fellows have engaged in extensive research at thirteen of the nation's outstanding educational centers. Their investigations involved such diverse problems as the conflict between Mexicans and native Americans in the Southwest, patterns of prejudice in young children, the effects of racial succession on property values in Chicago, participation of Negroes in labor unions, and the effects of psychotherapy on ethnic hostility.

The Livingston projects are linked by the common purpose of achieving more and more scientific insight to meet the challenging problems of modern human relations. The Livingston studies show

a number of basic post-war trends in human relations research, and, writ large, exemplify social science today.

It may be helpful to look at the current trends in social science research, as they are recorded in the work of the Sigmund Livingston fellows, and to compare them with research patterns of earlier periods. The three major recent trends in research in group relations, as they are seen in the Livingston researches, can be said to consist of

a) advances in research design
b) the psychological interpretation of prejudice as a function of personality
c) the study of the group, cultural, and institutional nexus of intergroup behavior

On the basis of these underlying trends, some new problems for the future suggest themselves. It is hoped that some of these problems can be resolved with the aid of future human relations research.

The term "human relations" has evolved to mean the application of social science knowledge to practical problems. Some thirty years ago, when the Yale Institute of Human Relations was established, it was hoped that "human relations" would subsume scholars from all of the social sciences, gathering together and applying their specialized skills to the solving of given problems in an interdisciplinary clinic fashion.

"Human relations" has gradually come to be a term used to describe those applications of social science which have ameliorative goals, like reducing prejudice and discrimination or maximizing the purposeful improvement of groups and individuals in their understanding of human problems. A number of agencies which have arisen in the last few decades to achieve social betterment through education and social action are usually called human relations agencies, e.g., the Anti-Defamation League.

The three major research rubrics under which the Livingston studies are analyzed are thus in the main line of "human relations" research.

CHAPTER II

The Historical Background

During the period following World War I, most of the concerns of social science revolved about the nature-nurture controversy. The study of intergroup relations was no exception. The importance of learning and culture in the determination of human characteristics, capacities, and attitudes had been suggested by the early theoretical work of such men as Charles H. Cooley,[1] George Herbert Mead,[2] and Robert E. Park.[3] However, the belief in the preponderance of biological influences on human characteristics and behavior was still widely held. This view took the forms of instinct theory in individual psychology and of racism in the study of group characteristics. To the extent that culture and social structure were considered, they were usually seen as mysterious, all-powerful, and immutable mores which changed, if at all, slowly and inscrutably, and were outside the province of human control.[4]

"Racial" differences in personality, intelligence, brain weight, brain convolutions, stature, physique, and economic, social and cultural achievement were quoted in support of the theory of innate invidious group distinctions. MacDougall's *Social Psychology*, the most popular text in its field, emphasized the instinctive basis of social behavior.[5] In the field of intergroup relations, instinct theory took the form of a perversion of Franklin H. Giddings' concept of "consciousness of kind." In this view (not to be found in Giddings' own work)[6] people are born with an instinctive recognition of their group membership and antagonism toward all those seen as different from themselves. Giddings developed his principle from a New

1. *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York, 1902. *Social Organization. A Study of the Larger Mind*, New York, 1912.
2. *Mind, Self and Society*, 1934. This volume was edited by Charles W. Morris from students' lecture notes after Mead's death. It represents ideas as developed and taught by Mead from 1900 on, and so represents a much earlier contribution than its date of publication would indicate.
3. Park, like Mead and W. I. Thomas, was very influential in sociology teaching and research at the University of Chicago, but never presented his views in a systematic advanced work. Written with Ernest W. Burgess, many of Park's views appear in *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Chicago, 1922. A collection of his technical articles has appeared recently in *Race and Culture*, Glencoe, Illinois, 1950.
4. William G. Sumner's *Folkways* (Boston, 1906) represented the most extreme and most influential expression of this position, which permeated much of the social thought of the time. For a critical view of Sumner, which has gained wide acceptance, see Gunnar Myrdal *et al.*, *An American Dilemma* (New York, 1944, pp. 1031-2).
5. William MacDougall, *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Boston, 1911.
6. Compare such views with Gidding's "The Scientific Scrutiny of Societal Facts," in V. F. Calverton, ed., *The Making of Society* (New York, 1937) pp. 610-623, especially pp. 619-20.

England carpenter he knew who used to talk about "our kind of folks."

The late twenties and early thirties saw successful efforts by environmentalists to destroy the empirical and theoretical underpinnings of instinctivism and racism. L. L. Bernard's monograph played a significant role in the rejection of the primitive instinct theory by most professional students of human behavior.[7] Along with the general disrepute of instinct theory, its special application to intergroup behavior in the theory of consciousness of kind was relinquished. Racism was attacked on many scientific fronts — for example a study was made which demonstrated that supposed differences in the development of the frontal area and the depth of convolutions of Negro and White brains were actually the results of the experimenter's prejudice. A second scientist, studying the same collection of brains made his judgments and measurements without prior knowledge of their racial classifications, and found no racial differences.[8]

Similarly, the results of the Army's intelligence testing program during World War I were re-analyzed. The original finding that Negroes scored lower than Whites had been given a racist interpretation by C. C. Brigham.[9] Later analysis by others showed that Negroes in some Northern states scored higher than Whites in some Southern states. Brigham had the grace and objectivity to retract his original stand.[10] The change in intellectual climate is illustrated by the *volte-face* of Howard Odum, who in 1910 had presented a racist interpretation of the social and mental traits of the Negro.[11] In 1936 Odum decried racism as an "error of sociology"[12] and later became perhaps the foremost Southern leader of the movement for an enlightened Negro policy.[13]

By the early thirties, social science had achieved a great deal. With the scientific demonstration that group differences were more complex than simple hereditary traits, the ground was cleared for the study of specific patterns of prejudice, discrimination and segregation. The study of these patterns localized and specified the way in which these social pathologies operate. By abandoning the simple notion of instinctive intergroup hostility, the main impediment to a scientific study of prejudice was removed. These accomplishments were largely negative: they only eliminated hoary dogmas which

7. L. L. Bernard, *Instinct*, New York, 1924.
8. The original findings were reported by R. B. Bean, "Some Racial Peculiarities of the Negro Brain," *American Journal of Anatomy*, 5, 1906, pp. 353-432. The refutation appeared in F. P. Mall's "On Several Anatomical Characters of the Human Brain," *American Journal of Anatomy*, 9, 1909, pp. 1-32.
9. C. C. Brigham, *A Study of American Intelligence*, Princeton, 1923.
10. C. C. Brigham, "Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups," *Psychological Review*, 37, 1930, pp. 158-165. For a fairly complete discussion of studies along these lines, see Otto Klineberg, *Race Differences*, New York, 1935.
11. Howard W. Odum, *Social and Mental Traits of the Negro*, New York, 1910.
12. Howard W. Odum, "The Errors of Sociology," *Social Forces*, 15, 1936-37, pp 327-342.
13. Odum's later views were presented in many books, e.g., *The Way of the South*, New York, 1947. Se also the obituary by William F. Ogburn, *American Sociological Review*, 20, 1955, p. 237.

paralyzed constructive thought. They did, however, pave the way for the more positive achievements of the following period.

During the decade of the thirties, advances were made in methods of research, the design of studies, and the theoretical conceptualization of problems of human relations. The most significant innovations of this period were in the measurement of attitudes. It was clear to even the earliest students that valid measures of prejudice were required if significant advances were to be made in the empirical study of its determinents. Emory S. Bogardus developed a "social distance scale" to measure the intimacy with which a person would admit various groups into relationships with him.[14] This scale has been widely used even to this day. L. L. Thurstone developed the "equal-appearing interval" scale technique for the measurement of attitudes, which was applied to the study of prejudice towards the Negro and the Jew.[15] Rensis Likert contributed an alternative method of attitude measurement which was also applied to the measurement of prejudice.[16] H. H. Remmers developed a generalized scale for the measurement of attitudes toward any social group.[17]

Following these developments in attitude measurement, there arose a number of studies of the extent to which different ethnic attitudes are distributed among different elements of the American population. These studies rarely rose above the purely descriptive level. They featured little theoretical elaboration and had very little direct relevance to problems of action in the field of human relations. "Attitudes" were often considered of fundamental importance in themselves. Little concern was given to the connection between prejudice and the total personality, or the person's actual behavior toward minorities in daily life. It was generally assumed that people would usually behave as could be predicted from their responses to an attitude test. It was also presumed that the attitude existed as a separate and distinct property of the individual, learned in youth, and carried with him as a fairly static entity through life. Under such conditions, the main task of research was to *describe* this property and its distribution in society.[18]

---

14. *Immigration and Race Attitudes*, Boston, 1928.
15. L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave, *The Measurement of Attitude*, Chicago, 1929.
16. Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 140, 1943.
17. H. H. Remmers and E. B. Silance, "Generalized Attitude Scales," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 1934, pp. 298-312. H. H. Grice, "The Construction and Validation of a Generalized Scale Designed to Measure Attitudes Towards Defined Groups," in H. H. Remmers, ed., *Studies in Attitudes*, Bulletin of Purdue University, Studies in Higher Education, 35, No. 4, 1934.
18. The first applications of the Bogardus scale, for example, were purely descriptive attempts to rank groups in social distance from the majority. See Bogardus, *op. cit.* The descriptive nature of research in this period is reflected in the results of opinion polls on anti-Semitism, summarized in Samuel H. Flowerman and Marie Jahoda's "Polls on Anti-Semitism: How Much Do They Tell Us?" *Commentary*, 1, 1946, pp. 82-86. The following studies illustrate the essentially descriptive emphasis of research in the thirties: D. Katz and K. W. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28, 1933, pp. 280-290; V. M. Sims and J. R. Patrick, "Attitude Toward the Negro of Northern and Southern College Students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 1936, pp. 192-204. Such work was essential at the time, and our characterization of it as "descriptive" is not meant in a derogatory sense. The "mapping" of the field of study was a necessary step towards research focussed upon theoretically derived hypotheses which came later. For a thorough discussion of research in this period, see Arnold M. Rose, *Studies in the Reduction of Prejudice*, Chicago, 1948.

A more valuable application of scaling techniques was in the developing field of experimental social psychology. Thurstone, for example, used his scale to test attitudes before and after viewing motion pictures in an attempt to estimate the influence of films on intergroup attitudes.[19] Investigators studied the effects of other mass media, of educational programs, and of intergroup contact, using attitude scales for the measurement of the effect of these experiences.[20]

It is clear by now that such advances in the study of *prejudice* or attitudes may not be of direct relevance to the study of *discrimination*, or other forms of intergroup behavior. During the thirties, lawyers, journalists, publicists, and a few social scientists continued the study of group discrimination using the traditional qualitative methods of journalism and scholarship. As long as quantitative methods were applied exclusively to the study of attitudes their ultimate contribution to the understanding of overt intergroup actions or discriminatory behavior could only be presumed. Partly because of the difference in methods of studying them, two distinct theories arose to account for prejudice and discrimination.

The research of the thirties suggested that prejudices were learned more through association with prejudiced people than through association with members of the minority group involved.[21] The "stereotypes" which Walter Lippman found in all areas of public opinion[22] were seen as especially prevalent in intergroup attitudes. In contrast, discrimination was usually regarded as a displacement of aggression, resulting from frustration, on to relatively powerless minority groups — the so-called "scapegoat theory."[23]

It is noteworthy that both of the favorite theories of the thirties — the development of prejudice almost exclusively through contact with prejudiced people, and the scapegoat theory — have recently been called into question. Both Gordon Allport and Robin Williams, two leaders in the field of intergroup research, have suggested that all that we know about human behavior indicates that it is *interactive*.[24] The behavior of any individual towards others must be understood as partly a response to the behavior of the others. Attention is returning to the question of what part characteristics and actions of minority group members might play in the development of stereotypes and prejudice.

---

19. L. L. Thurstone, "The Influence of Motion Pictures on Children's Attitudes," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 1931, pp. 291-305.
20. See, for example, F. Tredwell Smith, *An Experiment in Modifying Attitudes Toward the Negro*, New York, 1943. Experimental work along these lines has been summarized in the following: Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, New York, 1947; Gardner Murphy, Lois B. Murphy, and Theodore M. Newcomb, *Experimental Social Psychology*, New York, 1937; Arnold Rose, *op. cit.*
21. This view was expressed very widely in the late thirties and early forties, and still holds a prominant place in discussions, although in more complex form. One important study pointing in this direction was by Eugene L. Horowitz, "Development of Attitudes Toward Negroes," *Archives of Psychology*, 1936, No. 194. See also Gordon Allport and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology*, 22, 1946, pp. 9-39.
22. Walter Lippman, *Public Opinion*, New York, 1922.
23. See, e.g., John Dollard *et al.*, *Frustration and Aggression*, New Haven, 1939.
24. Allport calls this the "stimulus approach." See "Prejudice: a Problem in Psychological and Social Causation," *Journal of Social Issues*, Supplement Series 4, Nov. 1950.

The frustration-aggression hypothesis, adapted from Freud by the Yale University behaviorists, has been abandoned by its most prominent champions, at least in the oversimplified version in which it was first put forth.[25] Gardner Lindzey, a Sigmund Livingston Fellow, attempted to test the scapegoat theory experimentally, and found it difficult to maintain in the light of his experimental findings.[26] These recent developments do not mean that one's associates do not influence his attitudes, or that all prejudice can be traced to a "hard kernel of truth" in stereotypes, nor that frustration has no relevance to the development of intergroup hostility.

There is an awareness now, however, that not all of the people who are exposed to prejudices in the culture of their group are equally willing to accept these attitudes. As Maslow has shown, the concept of frustration is not as simple as it has been made to appear.[27] In addition, the relationship between prejudice and the structure of the personality now appears too complex for a simple frustration-aggression hypothesis to have much value. Considerable work has recently appeared explicating some of the complex connections betwen personality abnormalities and intergroup attitudes.[28]

World War II stimulated significant advances in intergroup research. The sense of crisis stemming from the tragedy of European Jewry brought increased activity by intergroup agencies and a renewed demand for research findings which would be immediately applicable to the solution of practical problems. "Action research" arose to fulfill this demand, under the leadership of Kurt Lewin.[29] Many projects aimed at the continuous evaluation of action programs by the best available scientific techniques. The resulting collaboration between scientists and those on the "firing line" had two salutary effects: it communicated the practitioner's sense of urgency to the scientist and impressed both specialists with the enormous difficulty of applying social science principles and research methods to concrete problems. It became evident, for example, that while the theoretical principle that prejudices were largely learned from one's associates could be demonstrated, it was difficult to find any clear directives for policy therein.

One result of the practitioner-social science collaboration was an enhanced recognition of the need for a deeper scientific understanding of prejudice and discrimination, and of the fundamental psychological and sociological processes underlying them. Establishment of the Sigmund Livingston Fellowship program and other instances of

25. See the "Symposium on Effects of Frustration" in the *Psychological Review*, 48, 1941, pp. 337-366, and of J. Dollard *et al.*, *op. cit.* Also Zawadski, "Limitations of the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 43, 1948, pp. 127-141.
26. Gardner Lindzey (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1947-48), "Experimental Examination of the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 45, 1950, pp. 296-309.
27. A. H. Maslow, "Deprivation, Threat, and Frustration," *Psychological Review*, 48, 1941, pp. 364-366.
28. Notably, Theodore W. Adorno *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, 1950.
29. See, for example, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York, 1948.

financial support by action agencies for basic research in human relations may be taken as indications of this trend.[30]

Not all social scientists welcomed the action research movement. The dean of American anthropology, A. L. Kroeber, has written that "I consider the development of fundamental science, whether of human relations or of anything else, a different matter from the solution of pragmatic problems . . . the science as science will not develop better or faster for having its pursuit mixed with problems of application." Kingsley Davis has pointed out that ". . . neither liberalism nor social science profits from confusing the two."[31] This view is widely held by many behavior scientists. There are many scientists who feel that there is nothing so practical as a good theory, and that they can best help practical situations by better theoretical and basic research. More and more scientists, however, are becoming involved in problems of applying research to practice.

The forties also featured a great increase in the use of experimental methods in social psychology. Like action research, experimental social psychological investigations were greatly stimulated by the work of Kurt Lewin and his collaborators in the Research Center for Group Dynamics, first at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and later at the University of Michigan. In such studies, attempts were made to bring under control the confusing jumble of variables operating in every interpersonal situation by simulating the laboratory techniques of natural science. Some students feel that this control is achieved at the expense of keeping the experimental results unsullied by any similarity to the problems faced by people in the real world outside the laboratory. Others feel that the potential contribution of experimental research is nearly unlimited.

Finally, great strides were made in the methodological and mathematical problems of attitude measurement by the action research program of the Research Branch of the War Department.[32] Perhaps because of the press of practical concerns, there were few comparable advances in theory.

By 1947, then, the Livingston Fellows had the following achievements of social science upon which to build:

1. The question of the innate equality of human groups had been disposed of to the satisfaction of nearly all professional scientists. The notion of inborn differences or inborn group antagonisms could no longer paralyze investigation by providing beforehand ready-made dogmatic answers.

---

30. E.g., excellent recent work on answering bigots, interracial housing, and work on personality correlates of prejudice.
31. Alfred L. Kroeber, "Critical Summary and Commentary," in Robert F. Spenser, editor, *Method and Perspective in Anthropology*, Minneapolis, 1954, p. 291; Kingsley Davis, Review of Gardner Murphy, *In The Minds of Men*, in *American Sociological Review*, 19, 1954, p. 488.
32. Samuel A. Stouffer *et al.*, *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, especially vol. 4, *Measurement and Prediction*, Princeton, 1950-1952. For an evaluation, see Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, *Studies in the Scope and Method of "The American Soldier"* Glencoe, 1953.

2. A number of studies showing the different cultural patterns of ethnic groups in American society, the distribution of prejudice, usually within the "majority" group, and patterns of discrimination and segregation, had been published.

3. Experience in "action research" had demonstrated both the value of the scientific study of the effectiveness of action programs and the inadequacy of many of the concepts and research tools available.

4. There was a widespread recognition of the importance of the individual's associates in the development of his attitudes toward minorities. While this principle was valuable in pointing to the importance of culture and social structure, it left many crucial problems unsolved. Where do the groups from which the individual learns his prejudices get their prejudices? Why would an individual choose one associate's attitudes to incorporate, rather than those of another associate with perhaps very different attitudes? What are the influences of the mass media on the formation and maintenance of attitudes? What is an attitude? How important are a person's contacts with members of a minority group?

5. The realization that personality dynamics play some role in ethnic hostility was a heritage of the scapegoat theory with its basis in the Freudian frustration-aggression hypothesis. The detailed psychological processes involved and the relations between personality and group factors remained to be specified.

6. An impressive array of research techniques, including experimental methods, many kinds of before and after methodologies, participant and non-participant observation, intensive and extensive interviewing, historiographic methods, the analysis of personal documents, and quantitative analysis were available. These were supplemented by increasingly sophisticated mathematical models, mainly designed for the measurement of attitudes. Experience and special tools had been developed for the application of measurement methods to the study of prejudice, stereotyping, social distance, social participation and intergroup contact. Some relevant dimensions of personality had already been isolated and studied.

CHAPTER III

Advances in Research Design

One of the major advances in modern social science, as exemplified in the Livingston studies, is in research design. It is a commonplace fact that the frame of reference with which an investigator approaches a problem strongly influences the value of his results. In comparing the assumptions involved in the design of the Livingston researches and their predecessors, there is one outstanding contrast. Whereas investigators in earlier periods assumed that certain special theories of prejudice and discrimination could be developed independently, current investigators constantly attempt to integrate intergroup theory with theories of general social science. This development is crucial — almost indispensable for progress in the field.

From the point of view of a methodologist, it would be no more appropriate to seek a special theory of floor lamps in physics or of mice in biology than to have a special theory of anti-Semitism in social science. Even the most rigorous methodologists, however, would have to take notice of the emotional baggage which anti-Semitism carries with it, as well as of the very complex historical roots of anti-Semitism and of the irrationality with which it is often maintained. These factors combine to make anti-Semitism one of the most controversial, baffling, and many-sided problems which social science has ever studied.

Among studies carried out by Sigmund Livingston Fellows, Kutner's study, in contrast to the specialized approach which sees prejudice as unidimensional, attempts to test the hypothesis that prejudice as a "faulty generalized judgment" would be associated with the prevalence of faulty generalized judgments in the solution of problems of deduction and induction.[33] His predictions are based upon a general psychological theory of cognition which makes no reference to intergroup problems as such. Yet many of his predictions regarding prejudiced and tolerant children are confirmed by his observations. Similarly, while in the thirties it was considered a

33. Bernard Kutner (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1949-50), "Patterns of Mental Functioning Associated with Prejudice in Children," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard, 1950.

major achievement to find that prejudices were learned from prejudiced associates, the assertion has become almost banal by now.

Reference group theory was used by Rosen to study the religious behavior of Jewish adolescents. This is a general theory of attitude development which makes no explicit reference to prejudice but claims predictive power in the study of all kinds of attitudes. Using reference group theory, Rosen traces the patterns of association ("cliques") among adolescent Jews in two communities, and measures the relative effect of the family and the peer group upon the Jewish adolescent's identification as a Jew and his religious beliefs and practices.[34]

This kind of integration of intergroup research with the basic principles and methods of general social science is illustrated in many of the fellowship studies. The absorption of intergroup research into the general field of social science research has had the effect of blurring the line between what is and is not considered intergroup research. The recognition of the essential unity of all studies of human relations has also broadened the focus of the field to include group situations other than the traditional problems of Negro-White, Jewish-Gentile relations, and so forth. Simmons, for example, studied the different cultures, the patterns of contact, the institutional contexts of subordination, stereotyping, discrimination, and reactions thereto of "Anglo-Americans" and "Mexican-Americans" in the Southwest.[35]

Similarly, Killian studied the position of southern white laborers residing in a transient area of Chicago, finding that they had many of the usual characteristics of a minority group — a discrepancy between their status and their aspirations, subjection to a stereotype label as "hillbillies," a defensive group consciousness, isolation, and residential and social segregation.[36]

The broadened horizon of intergroup research, as a result of its incorporation into the general body of social science, goes well beyond the study of additional intergroup situations. Some of the studies make no explicit reference to minority groups whatever! Yet their relevance to the understanding of intergroup problems can hardly be doubted at the present time. Swanson[37] attempted to see if the psychoanalytic behavior types of Freud (i.e., oral, anal, genital) could be used to predict how people would react in group situations. With important qualifications, he finds such variables as "leadership needs," "conformism," and "subscription to a democratic idealogy"

---

34. Bernard Rosen (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Cornell, 1950-51), "Religion, Reference Group Theory and Group Identification," Ph. D. Dissertation, Cornell, 1952. See also "Conflicting Group Membership: a Study of Parent-Peer Group Cross Pressures," *American Sociological Review*, 20, 1955, pp. 155-160.
35. Ozzie G. Simmons (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1947-48), "Anglo-Americans and Mexican Americans in South Texas: a Study in Dominant-Subordinate Group Relations," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard, 1952.
36. Lewis M. Killian (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1948-49), "Southern White Laborers in Chicago's West Side," M. A. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.
37. G. E. Swanson (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Michigan, 1948-49), "Some Effects of Member Object — Relationships on Small Groups," unpublished report to the Anti-Defamation League.

predictable through a test based on the psychoanalytic ideas of personality and how it functions.

Haskell examined the adjustment of matched pairs of children. One member of each pair had and the other member did not have experience in day-care centers.[38] This research was an exploration of the effects of an increasingly common yet relatively new pattern of American child rearing. He found day-care children better adjusted in many respects, including their recognition of reality and their relationships with peers — two elements which are evidently closely related to ethnic attitudes.

Naegele studied source of hostility and its control in the structure of the American middle class family, conceived as a social system of interacting roles.[39] Only at the conclusion of his report does he briefly describe the application of some of his findings to problems of ethnic hostility.

The fact that such research studies as Swanson's, Haskell's, and Naegele's could be sponsored by an intergroup agency reflects a full realization of the interdependence of social life, a sophisticated respect for fundamental science, and sufficient vision to seek the long-run reward, all of which bodes well for the future of intergroup research.

Current trends in research design also make increased use of technical advances in quantitative methods and experimental design. Notable in this respect are the studies of Ortmeyer[40] and Schlesinger.[41] The former addressed himself to the recurrent fundamental problem of whether there is a general underlying ethnocentric tendency, or only specific antagonisms toward particular groups. Ortmeyer was the first person to apply the methods of factor analysis to this problem, although the technique has been available since the mid-thirties. Schlesinger applied the method of analysis of variance to the study of the effects of various elements in peer-group relationships on changes in attitudes toward the Jew.

It should be noted that such studies represent significant methodological advances over previous approaches to the same problems. Factor analysis has been found eminently suitable for taking a given action or series of actions and breaking it down into its component parts. Factor analysis has been used, for example, to take a complex concept like the authoritarian personality and to break it down into its basic components. Variance analysis permits the experimenter to

38. Henry S. Haskell (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, New York University, 1947-48), "A Comparison of the Personalities of Children with and without Day Care Center Experience," Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University, 1952.
39. Kasper Naegele (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1949-50), "Hostility and Aggression in Middle-Class American Families," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1951.
40. Carl E. Ortmeyer (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Iowa State College, 1953-54), "Ethnic Attitudes of Children in Selected Town and Rural Areas in Iowa," Ph. D. Dissertation, Iowa State College, 1954.
41. Lawrence E. Schlesinger (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Boston University, 1950-51), "The Influence of Exposure to Peer Group Opinions on the Expression of Attitudes Toward a Minority Group," Ph. D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1955.

take a complex series of interrelated actions and study how any one of these actions affects the total. In general, the fellowship reports reflect the growing movement for more and better quantification in social research.

One Fellow, Jacob W. Getzels, worked specifically on problems of research methodology.[42] He found evidence of a difference in public and private opinions by comparing responses to structured questions, in which the subject selects from clear-cut and specific alternatives, and non-directive questions, where the subject was encouraged to talk freely and expansively to a general question. Getzels found that the individual's public opinions as revealed in his responses to direct questions were more tolerant than his private opinions as revealed by unstructured and projective questions. Such work reveals some of the differences in the kind of available problem which can be studied by different techniques.

Robert K. Merton and his associates have conducted a study which makes substantial innovations and advances in research design, and also provides new insights into the ways in which individuals are affected by their institutional environment.[43] The Livingston Fund granted fellowships to collaborators in this study, which will appear as: Robert K. Merton, Patricia S. West and Marie Jahoda, *Patterns of Social Life: Explorations in the Sociology of Housing.*

Merton's objective was to study the development of various types of role behavior and social relations within differing social structures. One community was bi-racial in composition, with relatively little interest in political activity; the other was racially though not ethnically homogeneous, with great interest in local political life.

On the basis of anthropological field observation and detailed interviews with members of every household in these communities, the study contradicts the prevailing view that intimate friendships uniformly develop between those of like social kind. Instead, the research shows this pattern is greatly modified in certain types of community structure. "Birds of a feather flock together," as the catch phrase has it, only under specifiable social conditions.

The relationship between a person's attitude and his behavior has long been a subject of controversy in intergroup research. Merton and his associates trace some of the complex connections between behavior and attitudes in intergroup situations.

Several kinds of methodological advances in this study can be barely mentioned here. The study introduced the concept of a "research budget," which integrates a time-budget for each phase

42. Jacob W. Getzels (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1948-49), "The Relationship Between Covert and Overt Levels of Attitude and Personality Organization as Revealed by the Method of Paired Projective and Direct Questionnaires," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard, 1952. An abstract appeared in the *American Psychologist*, vol. 7, 1952, p. 318. See also the author's "The Question-Answer Process: a Conceptualization and Some Derived Hypotheses for Empirical Examination," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 18, 1954, pp. 80-91.

43. Special thanks are due Professor Merton for permitting us to see typescripts of the studies of housing and the professions.

of the research, a personnel-budget for component research operations and a financial budget. The flow of scientific work, as distinct from the design of the study, is clearly exhibited in such a format, which has since been adopted in other social science studies. The study utilized a sequential research design, in which each type of field data (interview, observation, institutional statistics) was analyzed *before* new data were collected. In this way, there developed a successive cumulation of data, each set of which was known to be pertinent to the new problems and hypotheses evolving in the course of the study.

To mention only one other procedural innovation: preliminary manuscripts based on qualitative field observation and interviews were analyzed to ascertain whether the informants contributing most of the data *actually utilized* in the manuscript were representative of the local population at large. This candid appraisal, which found an undue reliance upon informants with whom the field-staff had greatest rapport, was then made the basis for a revised analysis. This pattern of appraising qualitative field studies has great bearing upon anthropological studies which generally rely very substantially upon qualitative data.

Another study by Merton and his associates also contributes both to the advancement of a framework for social research and to the understanding of the emergence and behavior of institutional groups. This study will appear as *The Professions in American Society*, by William J. Goode and Robert K. Merton, with the assistance of Mary Jean Huntington. Miss Huntington was the recipient of a Livingston fellowship during part of her work on this study. It represents a comprehensive and thorough-going analysis of available materials on the professions and aims to provide a framework for the substantial research still required in this field. The major divisions for research examined in the book include the criteria of a profession, descriptive statistics, the scope and limits of professional activity, inter-professional relations, public images of the professions, natural history of professions, recruitment, education and career patterns, professional role, style of life, personality factors, client-professional relations, client selection of professionals, professional associations, legal controls and codes of ethics.

A major new trend in the group relations field is the development of sophisticated research designs for evaluation of programs of different group agencies. The painful urgency of many of the problems of group relations has led many agencies to use evaluation to determine how well they are doing, what they are doing, and the assumptions and effects of what they are doing.

Evaluation has been defined by Henry W. Riecken as "measurement of desirable and undesirable consequences of an action that has been taken in order to forward some goal that we value." Robert B.

Johnson, who has just completed an evaluation of the Community Relations Program of the American Friends Service Committee, reports that evaluation may involve measuring the change resulting from a specific stimulus, determining if a group is doing what it started out to do, and studying the internal structure of an organization to determine whether the organization is operating with maximum efficiency.[44]

44. Quotation from Riecken and summary of Johnson's results from a mimeographed memorandum by Robert B. Johnson, *Evaluation*, May 31, 1955, p. 11.

CHAPTER IV

Psychological Interpretations of Prejudice As a Function of Personality

Perhaps the most prominent trend in intergroup research during the postwar period has been the increased interest in the psychological dynamics and personality correlates of prejudice. This movement was stimulated by the growing popular awareness of and research interst in psychoanalysis and the studies conducted at the University of California by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, Sanford, Rokeach and others, summarized in *The Authoritarian Personality.*[45]

The notion of a personality syndrome predisposing people to accept stereotypes and to display ethnic hostility is not new; it can be found in Erich Fromm's *Escape From Freedom,* which refers to earlier German writers on the subject.[46] The special contribution of the California studies was to show how such assertions could be tested by projective techniques and attitude scales, and to specify a number of the personality dynamics more completely. These studies found high prejudice associated with: extraordinary concern with conventional morality; a tendency to project deviant motivations of others; cognitive limitations, including a high degree of "generalized mental rigidity"; diffuse anxiety; alternating subordination and dominance in interpersonal relations; unusual sexual repression; intolerance of ambiguity; and other tendencies.

One assumption made by such a theory of prejudice is that hostility toward outgroups is a general psychological tendency, rather than a specific antagonism toward a particular group.[47] In support of this belief, the California researchers point to a high relationship

45. See Footnote 28. An evaluation of these studies appears in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authorization Personality*, Glencoe, 1954.
46. Erich Fromm, *Escape From Freedom,* New York, 1941. Footnote 3, p. 212, refers to a questionnaire study, conducted during 1929 and 1930, of class differences with regard to personality and intergroup attitudes. Other precursors include Gardner Murphy and Rensis Likert, *Public Opinion and the Individual,* New York, 1938, who found a high relationship between generalized ethnocentrism and political-economic conservation. In *Problems in Prejudice* (New York, 1946), Eugene Hartley reports finding personality patterns in prejudicial subjects very similar to those reported in the *Authoritarian Personality.* See also A. H. Maslow, "The Authoritarian Character Structure," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 18, 1943, pp. 401-411.
47. A special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* (vol. 5, no. 3, 1949) was devoted to "Consistency and Inconsistency in Intergroup Relations." This issue shows that there are many different problems of consistency. For example, do people discriminate against a group in one situation and not in another? We are dealing here with one special problem of consistency — the extent to which prejudice against a particular group reflects a general tendency to prejudice against all out-groups.

between prejudice toward Jews, Negroes, and "other races," indicating the existence of a generalized "ethnocentrism." This conclusion is supported by a great deal of other data.[48]

A study closely focused on this issue was conducted by Ortmeyer.[49] Using techniques of factor and profile analysis, he identified a generalized prejudice factor in responses of school children to thirty statements about Negroes, Mexicans, Catholics, Jews, and other races and religions. This supports the belief in a general prejudice tendency which underlies many personality-oriented studies.

Once the general factor of prejudice was identified, existing as a kind of underlying substration, further analysis broke this down into its basic components. Ortmeyer's results are instructive. Two clusters of statements about the Negro were found: acceptance of Negroes in personal association, and willingness to grant Negroes equal rights.

The only statements about Catholics which formed a cluster were the statements regarding their *power*. A cluster of statements showing willingness to admit Jews to personal association was found. Children showed the most aversion to Catholic power, to Negro association, and to "romantic" association with Mexicans and "all other races." Thus while a general ethnocentrism seems to be present, special and quite different kinds of prejudices also seem to operate in these subjects' attitudes toward particular minorities. Prejudice seems to be so complicated that it is not adequately explained by calling it *either* a generalized tendency *or* a collection of specific qualities which manifest themselves in specific situations. It seems to be both generalized and specific.

Departing from findings of the California study,[50] Kutner designed some experiments on the following basic questions: Are prejudices special instances of faulty general judgments found in the cognitive functioning of some individuals?[51] He advanced the following hypotheses:

1) Prejudiced people would show inferior ability to form complex concepts.

2) They would deduce more numerous and less valid conclusions from given premises than tolerant people.

---

48. E.g., Murphy and Likert, *op. cit.*, found evidence of a "generalized tolerance" in their subjects Eugene L. Hartley, in *Problems in Prejudice* (New York, 1946), reports a widely quoted study in which he found clear evidence of prejudice toward non-existent groups with plausible foreign-sounding names. Two Sigmund Livingston Fellows report data supporting the contention of a generalized ethnocentrism. Gardner Lindzey (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1947-48) and Saul Rogolsky report incidental findings in their study, "Prejudice and Identification of Minority Group Membership," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 45, 1950, pp. 37-53, showing significant relationships between anti-Catholic sentiment and antagonism towards Negroes and Jews. Andrew Kapos (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Michigan, 1949-50) found significant relationships between willingness to admit different minority groups to fraternity membership: see "Some Individual and Group Determinants of Fraternity Attitudes Toward the Admission of Members of Certain Minority Groups," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.

49. Carl E. Ortmeyer (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Iowa State College, 1954), "Ethnic Attitudes of Children in Selected Towns and Rural Areas in Iowa," Ph. D. Dissertation, Iowa State College, 1953-54.

50. I.e., the *Authoritarian Personality*. See footnote 28.

51. Bernard Kutner (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1949-50), "Patterns of Mental Functioning Associated with Prejudice in Children," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard, 1950.

3) They would exhibit more categorical, dichotomous or "class" thinking than tolerant people.

4) They would persevere in attachment to rigid, inappropriate mental sets.

Kutner subjected seven-year olds to prejudice tests and to a series of cognitive problems, a concept formation test, and a deduction test. He found prejudiced children:

1) Less capable of forming the "higher order concept" of similarity in size in the solution of a grouping problem.

2) More prone to offer inadequate and repetitive hypotheses.

3) More likely to jump to conclusions and make wild guesses.

4) More often persevering in a hypothesis already proven inadequate.

The results of the deduction test showed no difference between the two test groups with respect to the number of conclusions drawn from given premises, or the number of correct conclusions. These findings contradicted the second hypothesis, but prejudiced children had significantly more difficulty with those deduction problems in which the answer was *ambiguous*. They also tended (more than the tolerant group) to insist upon transforming the ambiguous problems into syllogistic form. These conclusions support Else Frenkel-Brunswik's contention that prejudiced people show an unusual "intolerance of ambiguity."[52]

In their responses to open-ended attitude questions, prejudiced children used such terms as "some" less often while they tended to use universals, like "all," more frequently than the less prejudiced. This pattern, teacher's ratings, and the tendency to transform ambiguous deduction questions into syllogisms, lend support to the third hypothesis which links prejudice with dichotomous either-or thinking.

Kutner's data show no consistent support for his fourth hypothesis, linking prejudice with perseveration in mental set. It is instructive to compare this study with Rokeach's research, which was probably the first experimental approach to the subject of cognition and prejudice.[53] He presented his subjects with problems in arithmetic and map reading, and provided them with a fairly complicated method for their solution. Prejudiced subjects tended to use the method suggested to them regardless of the problem. Tolerant subjects, in contrast, shifted to a much simpler method of solution when the type of problem warranted.

---

52. See T. W. Adorno *et al., op. cit.*, and E. Frenkel-Brunswik, "Tolerance toward Ambiguity as a Personality Variable," (abstract) *American Psychologist*, 3, 1948, p. 268. Also Else Frenkel-Brunswik and R. Nevitt Sanford, "Some Personality Correlates of Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Psychology*, 20, 1945, pp. 271-291. Jack and Jeanne Block performed an experiment demonstrating this point. They found a definite relationship between the number of trials necessary for subjects to establish norms in judging the "movement" of light in a darkroom (the "autokinetic effect") and their scores on a scale of ethnocentric attitudes. See "An Investigation of the Relationship between Intolerance of Ambiguity and Ethnocentrism," *Journal of Personality*, 19, 1950, pp. 303-11.

53. Milton Rokeach, "Generalized Mental Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 43, 1948, pp. 259-278.

This procedure leaves considerable doubt about whether the rigid use of the original method by prejudiced subjects was due to a generalized perseverative tendency or a tendency to obey the instructions of the experimenter, who is a symbol of high status. In Kutner's experiment, the original mental set for the solution of problems was not presented explicitly by the experimenter, but was developed subtly by the repetition of simple tasks. The absence of a clear tendency towards greater perseveration among Kutner's prejudiced subjects might indicate that Rokeach's subjects were merely exhibiting the obedience characteristic of authoritarians when in subordinate roles.

One of the more important implications of the Kutner study is that some of the personality correlates of prejudice appear at least as early as seven years of age. Such findings lend weight to the psychoanalysts' emphasis upon the significance of early childhood training for the individual's later social relations. A number of the Livingston Fellows have made contributions to the study of special aspects of child care. Reference has already been made to Haskell's attempt to discern the effects of day-care center experience on personal adjustment, and to Naegele's analysis of the relationship of hostility to family structure.

Park's study of the effects upon prejudice of changes in the satisfaction of children's emotional needs is also directed at this problem.[54] He administered tests of emotional needs and of prejudice to children before and after their teachers took part in a training program designed to provide skills in meeting the child's emotional needs. Teachers were not informed of the experimenter's interest in problems of prejudice. It is therefore all the more significant that those children whose needs were better met after the experimental period showed less anti-Negro prejudice, while those whose needs were less well met showed more anti-Negro prejudice. Changes in prejudices against Jews and Catholics were much less marked, posing again the tantalizing question of whether prejudices against the various minorities in the United States have the same psychological roots.

Besides early childhood training, the psychoanalytic approach to prejudice points to the importance of psychotherapy for the improvement of human relations. Because of the paucity of data on this significant issue, the pioneering contribution of a Livingston research is relevant. Haimowitz conducted a study of nondirective psychotherapy[55] in reducing ethnic hostility.[56]

---

54. Lawrence Park (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, New York University, 1949-50), "Some Relationships between Emotional Needs and Prejudices of Intermediate Grade Children," Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University, 1950.
55. Carl R. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Boston, 1942.
56. Morris L. Haimowitz (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1947-48), "The Development and Change of Ethnic Hostility," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951. See also his article with Natalie Haimowitz, "Reducing Ethnic Hostility through Psychotherapy," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 1950, pp. 231-241.

In nondirective therapy, developed by Carl Rogers, the client is encouraged to express himself in an environment in which he can freely ventilate his feelings and express his basic drive toward health. Intensive interviews were conducted with 95 patients before and after therapy. No net changes in prejudice were found in the group as a whole, but there was a tendency for those whose personality adjustment improved in therapy to show reduced hostility toward Negroes and Jews. Haimowitz' interviews also clearly reveal the importance of the attitudes of the patient's family and friends in the development of his prejudices.

Such cultural factors as the family and friends' influence and their effect on and reciprocal relations with the individual's basic personality constitute some of the most significant problems faced by social research today. The role concept is one way in which this gap is being bridged, with many studies being made on how a person learns and acquires the different roles which he exhibits in his behavior, and how he reacts to the pull of different roles.

The problem of relating psychological and sociological factors is posed dramatically in another Livingston study. Swanson hoped to demonstrate the effectiveness of psychoanalytic personality qualities like orality and anality in predicting how people will behave in a group situation.[57] The "Blacky Test," a projective device with checklist questions, was administered to members of two experimental groups. The test was scored in Freudian personality categories. Swanson's initial interpersonal interpretation of these categories expected certain test combinations to predict such variables as the amount of participation of each individual in group discussions, his popularity, his susceptibility to influence, his ability to influence others, the extent to which he had a democratic ideology, his need to exercise leadership, and his degree of conformism. These predictions held true with surprising frequency in one experimental group, while they were rarely true of behavior in the second.

The author interprets these contradictory results as due to a difference in the groups' atmosphere. One was a congenial and cooperative group, the other a threatening, tense and uncomfortable group. Returning to his theory, Swanson developed new predictions which took account of the group situation in which the behavior took place. These new predictions pointed out how individuals would behave differently in the changed social situation, sometimes even behaving in a way which was the exact opposite of their original behavior.

---

57. G. E. Swanson (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Michigan, 1948-49), "Some Effects of Member Object-Relationships on Small Groups," unpublished report to the Anti-Defamation League. Jeanne Watson, in *The Application of Psychoanalytic Measures of Personality to the Study of Social Behavior*. Ann Arbor, 1953, mimeographed, used Blacky pictures to determine persons who were hostile, anxious, and narcissistic, and related these underlying personality qualities to social behavior.

This new theory accurately predicted behavior in both the congenial and the threatening groups. This result illustrates an important lesson: Swanson's experience indicates that the explanation or prediction of behavior in social situations cannot be successful if we merely add together psychological and sociological factors separately considered. Entirely different psychological criteria must be used with different group situations. This problem is treated at greater length in some of the more sociologically oriented fellowship reports.

CHAPTER V

Studies of Group, Cultural, and Institutional Nexus of Intergroup Behavior

Side by side with increased interest in the psychological dynamics of prejudice, the Sigmund Livingston Fellowship reports show continued concern with the sociological elements involved in intergroup relations. The "'sociological approach" is illustrated by a number of the Livingston studies.

Reference has already been made to Killian's study of southern-born white laborers in Chicago.[58] His materials suggest that the white laborers are in a minority group position in Chicago. This minority group position insulates them from the mainstream of Chicago community life and minimizes what might otherwise be a detrimental influence on Negro-White relations in the area. The Southern laborers thus became a new and relatively isolated minority group. This minority group keeps to itself and thereby minimizes conflicts between the races. This kind of explanation successfully accounts for an important phenomenon by using a sociological explanation and not bringing in psychological considerations.

Killiân's research and Simmons' analysis of the relations between Mexicans and Anglo-Americans in the Southwest[59] indicate a broadened interest in the study of minority groups. No longer is "intergroup relations" defined as the study of majority attitudes toward Jews, Negroes, and European immigrants. Griffiths and Hirabayashi surveyed the field of *inter-minority* relations in Seattle.[60] Samples of Negroes, Chinese, Japanese and Whites, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews were interviewed on many subjects including: knowledge and opinions on civil rights legislation; awareness of discrimination; social distance from one another; perceived changes in intergroup attitudes; and interest and participation in intergroup programs. This study illustrates two significant new emphases in intergroup

58. Lewis M. Killian (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1948-49), "Southern White Laborers in Chicago's West Side," M. A. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1949.
59. Ozzie Simmons (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1947-48), "Anglo-Americans and Mexican Americans in South Texas: a Study in Dominant-Subordinate Group Relations," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.
60. Keith S. Griffiths (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Washington, 1949-50), "An Audit of Intergroup Relations in the City of Seattle," mimeographed report to the Committee on Intergroup Relations of the Health and Welfare Council of Seattle, Washington Public Opinion Laboratory, University of Washington, September, 1950. The project reported therein was directed jointly by Griffiths and Gordon Hirabayashi, Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Washington, 1949-50.

research: responses of groups to their own minority status, and inter-minority relations.

Special attention is also being paid to the effect of sub-cultural variations within the American majority group upon group relations. The danger of "stereotyping the majority" has been indicated a number of times. North-South differences in racial attitudes and other elements of culture have ben widely recognized but, as the regional studies of the University of North Carolina indicate, they do not exhaust the complex subcultural variations of American society. It would be surprising if these did not influence regional differences in group relations. Edna Cooper Masuoka's study of the beliefs of Southern-born white notables about the race problem may be considered a special contribution to our information in this field.[61]

Stimulated by studies such as the Yankee City Series,[62] Davis and the Gardners' *Deep South,*[63] and Drake and Cayton's *Black Metropolis,*[64] post-war intergroup research shows a special interest in the differentiation and the organization of minority group life. This is reflected in Gloria May's study of the life of Negro adolescents in Elmira, New York.[65] Lawrence Fuchs attempted to explain some patterns of Jewish voting.[66] Jews seemed to be an exception to the rule that more privileged economic groups tend to vote Republican. While the economic status of the Jewish group improved greatly during the thirties and forties, their votes shifted more and more from the Republican to the Democratic Party, according to opinion polls and the analysis of election statistics in predominantly Jewish wards. Furthermore, Fuchs conducted interviews in Boston which showed that Jews with higher socio-economic status voted Republican even less frequently than lower status Jews.

Fuchs explains this consistent preponderance of Democratic voting among Jews since 1933 as being due to the concordance between the idealogy of the Democratic Party and the values of social justice, learning, charity, and non-ascetism in Jewish tradition. In addition, he points out that the insecurity of the Jewish community after the rise of Hitler led to a need for a liberal government. The reversal of the correlation between socio-economic status and voting among Jews, however, cannot be explained in these ways. We may speculate that the lack of social acceptance of wealthier Jews by the upper classes of "society" might prevent the alienation of successful members of the minority from the social organization, values, ideologies,

61. Edna C. Masuoka (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Fisk University, 1949-50), "Distinguished Southern-Born White Migrants and their Solutions for the 'Race Problem,'" unpublished mimeographed paper. See also H. W. Odum and H. E. Moore, *American Regionalism,* New York, 1938.
62. W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups,* New Haven, 1946.
63. Allison Davis, Burleigh B. Gardner and Mary R. Gardner, *Deep South,* Chicago, 1941.
64. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis,* New York, 1945.
65. Gloria May (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Cornell, 1949-50), "A Study of Negro Youth in Elmira, N. Y.," to be published in a volume reporting on a large scale community study conducted at Cornell.
66. Lawrence H. Fuchs (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Brandeis University, 1953-54), "American Jews and the Democratic Vote," unpublished mimeographed report.

and interests of their group of origin. Not incorporated in the social life of higher status groups, the wealthier Jews do not learn to identify their economic interests with Republicanism. On the other hand, higher economic status often brings the individual to a position of leadership in the Jewish community, thus increasing his identification with the interests, values, and views of his religious group. Thus the exclusive "upper crust" contributes to the solidarity of the "Jewish vote," which then sometimes acts as a rationalization of the social discrimination which helped to produce it.

What connection can there be between these studies of the social organization, the culture, and the attitudes of minority groups and the study of majority group behavior, like prejudice, intergroup aggression, or discrimination? Does the field of intergroup research break down into two wholly independent subjects — the study of minority group life and of the majority's treatment of minorities? How can these two emphases be reconciled?

Perhaps it will help to postulate *two* points of connection between the study of the majority and of the minority groups which are of fundamental theoretical importance. As Fuchs' study indicates, some minority group behavior can be understood primarily as a form of response to its minority group status and its treatment by the larger society. The scapegoat theory suggests that one possible response of the recipient of discrimination is hostility toward other minorities. The Fellowship study of Seattle by Griffiths and Hirabayaski shows that this is, at most, one of a number of possible alternatives.[67] There is evidence to show that there is a great variation among religious and ethnic groups in the amount of inter-ethnic hostility they display.

Fuchs' study shows that another alternative of the minority group to discrimination may be a common political stand. Others include accommodation and assimilation to the majority, insulation and voluntary segregation, striving for mobility, the protection of the group's traditional culture, or making common cause with other minorities. The great diversity of reactions to minority group status presents a challenging field for research. Under what conditions do organized groups or individuals respond to various forms of prejudice, discrimination, or oppression in various ways?

Besides the effects of the majority's treatment of minorities on the latter's group life, we might also consider the effects of the minority subculture on attitudes or actions of the majority. A special case in this area of problems is what Allport refers to as "the stimulus approach." He suggests that "until we know to what extent our generalized antipathy is based on provocative facts, we shall not be able to determine the extent of the irrationality that remains."[68] This

67. Griffiths, *op. cit.*
68. Gordon W. Allport, "Prejudice: a Problem in Psychological and Social Causation," in Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, 1951, p. 370.

is a revival of the belief in a "hard kernel of truth" in the majority's stereotypes, which was largely rejected in the thirties.

A broad "interactive" approach to intergroup relations might have considerable heuristic utility. There are many ways in which minority behavior can influence majority actions without conforming to the stereotyped expectations. This is recognized implicitly in the policies of many intergroup agencies which attempt to guide minority group actions. An illustration of the subtlety of this problem is provided by the results of a Fellowship study conducted by Gardner Lindzey.[69] With photographs from a college yearbook as stimuli, he found that people could distinguish Jewish from Gentile faces more often than chance expectancy. Furthermore, prejudiced people were more accurate in identifying Jews than tolerant subjects, and this difference is independent of the greater tendency of the prejudiced to label a picture as Jewish. The difference was found both with "extreme" Jewish faces and more ambiguous cases. A replication of this experiment by another experimenter questioned this finding.[70]

One common criticism of attitude studies is that attitudes are often treated as if they were totally divorced from the institutional context of behavior. Partly in reaction to this criticism, some research has lately appeared on the manifestations of prejudice and discrimination in institutional settings, such as the economy, the family, and the residential neighborhood. Dietrich Reitzes conducted a study to test the hypothesis that the behavior of Whites toward Negroes is more a function of the collective definition of their interests in various institutional situations than of their individual attitudes.[71] He examined a situation in which the *same* Whites accepted Negroes at work and in shopping centers while they rejected Negroes as neighbors in their residential neighborhood. He traced these "inconsistencies" to the promotion of intergroup amity by the union, the Chamber of Commerce policy of seeking Negro trade, and the exclusionist position of the neighborhood Civic Club. Subsequent interviews with Whites who lived in the exclusive neighborhood and belonged to the union showed that residents who were more involved in the collective life of the neighborhood were more likely to reject Negroes as neighbors, while those who were highly involved in union activities were significantly more willing to accept

69. Gardner Lindzey (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard, 1947-48), and Saul Rogolsky, "Prejudice and Identification of Minority Group Membership," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 45, 1950, pp. 37-53.

70. Cf. V. Seeleman, "The Influence of Attitude upon the Remembering of Pictorial Material," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 258, 1940. Seeleman found prejudiced subjects *less* accurate in recognizing *individual* Negro faces. To the prejudiced, all Negroes look alike. This, of course, does not contradict Lindzey's findings. On gestural behavior of ethnic groups, see D. Efron and J. P. Foley, Jr., "Gestural Behavior and Social Setting," in T. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, New York, 1947, pp. 33-39. Launor F. Carter, "The Identification of 'Racial' Membership," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 43, 1948, pp. 279-286, challenges the ability to identify Jewish faces.

71. Dietrich C. Reitzes (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1948-49), "Collective Factors in Race Relations," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950. See also "The Role of Organizational Structures," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 9, 1953, pp. 37-44; "Note on Race Relations in Mass Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 58, 1952, pp. 240-246 (with Joseph D. Lohman); and "Deliberately Organized Groups and Racial Behavior," *American Sociological Review*, 19, 1954, pp. 342-344 (with Joseph D. Lohman).

Negroes at work. There were no correlations between the acceptance of Negroes at work, in shopping, and in the neighborhood. Such findings throw considerable doubt on the concept of discrimination as a simple function of prejudice, which in turn is a manifestation of a personality pattern.

Greer studied patterns of discrimination and participation of ethnic groups in thirty International unions and twenty locals.[72] He found large variations in the number of members of ethnic groups and in their job levels among service, craft, industrial, and "one job" unions. Kornhauser, in a study of the thirty-four unions representing 75 per cent of the organized workers in 1948 (representing an equal proportion of C.I.O., A.F.L. and Independent workers), attempted to find the factors influencing union racial policies.[73] He found the A.F.L. and Independent unions considerably more often discriminatory than the C.I.O. He explains this by the difference in expedient means in the struggle for power inherent in the industrial and craft types of union organization, rather than by fundamental differences in ideology. This interpretation is supported by many facts: the industrial sections of craft unions often include Negroes; the A.F.L. shifted from a policy of interracial solidarity, when at an early point in its history it found that this policy stood in the way of its institutional interests; unions, which in practice exclude members of minority groups from membership, may be committed on paper to a formal and official democratic ideology, and industrial unions will occasionally exclude Negroes in special cases where their interests are involved.

Kornhauser also found that Negro union officials are usually elected under the sponsorship of white leaders who are involved in intra-mural or jurisdictional disputes, and who need support from large Negro sectors of the membership.[74] The Negro leader initially performs a symbolic role with highly circumscribed functions and power, which may be expanded later to include real decision making responsibilities. This again indicates the essentially non-formalized and political and economic nature of unions' racial patterns.

Other Fellows did work in different institutional settings. Naegele conducted repeated intensive interviews with mothers and fathers in twenty-one middle class families in an attempt to find the sources of hostility and how the family handled the hostility.[75] Amerman studied the intergroup educational programs in Chicago public schools.[76]

---

72. Scott Greer (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of California, 1949-50 and 1950-51), "The Participation of Ethnic Minorities in the Labor Unions of Los Angeles County," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, 1952.
73. William Kornhauser (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1949-50), "Labor Unions and Race Relations: a Study of Union Tactics," M. A. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1950.
74. William Kornhauser, "The Negro Union Official: A Study of Sponsorship and Control," *American Journal of Sociology*, 57, 1952, pp. 443-452.
75. Kasper D. Naegele (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Harvard University, 1949-50), "Hostility and Aggression in Middle-Class American Families," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard, 1951.
76. Helen E. Amerman (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1949-50), "The Impact of Intergroup Relations on non-Segregated Urban Public Education," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.

She analyzed the influence of public education as a social institution and showed the many ways in which intergroup relations infringe on the school system. She suggests that educators must analyze their own values and recognize that an organization like a school system exists as an entity with its own values, over and beyond those of its personnel.

Kapos surveyed the attitudes of members of thirty segregated, white, Gentile fraternities at Ann Arbor.[77] He found more prejudice towards Jews than towards Negroes, but, at the same time, more willingness to admit Jews. This, he suggests, is because the group standards are less strongly opposed to religious integration than racial integration, despite the attitudes of individuals.

By means of a detailed analysis of real estate prices in Chicago from 1940 to 1951, Schietinger tested the common belief that land values in a neighborhood are reduced as a result of an "invasion" of Negro tenants.[78] His conclusion that "supply and demand" rather than prejudice were the important factors in real estate market fluctuations is consonant with Reitzes' conclusion that the perceived interests of the collective group rather than individual attitudes determine interracial attitudes in union, shopping, and residential situations, and is consonant with Kornhauser's analysis of unions' Negro policies. Schietinger's conclusion, like those of other studies of this problem, directly contradicts the prevailing myth that real estate values decline when a minority group moves into an area.

The integration of intergroup research into the mainstream of social science is demonstrated by the way in which the influence of a person's associates on prejudice is conceived today. Reference group theory has developed as an attempt to state systematically the effects of associates and of group identifications on the attitudes of the individual.[79] Utilizing this approach, Rosen studied the relationship between the religious practices, attitudes, and informal group memberships and the identification of Jewish adolescents in Elmira, New York, and Philadelphia.[80] He found the pressures of both the peer group and the family highly significant. Lazerwitz measured the degree of identification with the Jewish group, from the extremes of "pluralism" or high identification to "assimilationism" or low identification in young Jewish adults.[81] He found this variable signifi-

77. Andrew Kapos, "Some Individual and Group Determinants of Fraternity Attitudes toward the Admission of Members of Certain Minority Groups," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.
78. E. F. Schietinger (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1948-49), "Racial Succession and Changing Property Values in Residential Chicago," published by the Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations of the University of Chicago for the Council Against Discrimination of Greater Chicago, June, 1953.
79. See M. Sherif, *An Outline of Social Psychology*, New York, 1948, and T. Newcomb, *Social Psychology*, New York, 1950.
80. Bernard Rosen (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Cornell University, 1950-51), "Religion, Reference Group Theory, and Group Identification," Ph. D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1952. See also, "Conflicting Group Membership: a Study of Parent-Peer Group Cross-Pressures," *American Sociological Review*, 20, 1955, pp. 155-160.
81. Bernard Lazerwitz (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, University of Chicago, 1950-51), "Some Factors of Jewish Identification," M. A. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1952.

cantly correlated with a surprising variety of others: religious practices, participation in formal Jewish organizations, fund raising activity, intentions regarding Jewish education for children, membership in a congregation, denominational beliefs, plans for the confirmation of children, number of Gentile friends, subscription to Jewish magazines, and degree of social distance from Gentiles.

While this study indicates that the degree of one's identification as a Jew has significant consequences, Garfinkel's study of Jews on membership lists of Jewish organizations in Ann Arbor, Michigan, showed that the type of Jewish identication has little relationship to the number of religious practices or relations with Gentiles.[82] Garfinkel got her subjects from the membership lists of Jewish organizations, so that her subjects might be presumed to have a reasonably clear identification as Jews who are interested in communal work. Within this group, those with the "pious orthodox," "religious traditionalist," "cultural autonomist," and "Zionist" emphases in their Jewish identification did not differ with regard to the observance of holidays, or relations with Gentiles.

The sociologically oriented studies among the Sigmund Livingston Fellowship reports demonstrate anew that the psychological dynamics and personality correlates of prejudice do not exhaust the factors relevant to understanding the problems of intergroup relations. Individual attitudes are anchored in the culture of the groups with which the individual associates and identifies. In different institutional settings, the same individual with the same prejudices and personality will manifest entirely different behavior. Group interests, standards, and definitions of the situation, can outweigh the prejudices of individuals. The challenging problem of how to combine our knowledge of the psychological and the sociological approach still remains to be solved.

82. Rosalynd S. Garfinkel, "A Study in Minority Group Relations: the Jewish Community of Ann Arbor," M. A. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1950.

CHAPTER VI

Research on Group Relations: Whither Now?

One central problem of intergroup research has always been the complex issue of the relationship of research to action. In the twenties, the nature-nurture controversy restricted the issue to the elementary level of whether or not social action of any sort could be effective. The primarily descriptive level of research in the thirties made the application of findings to action policies very difficult. The rise of "action research" in the forties represented a concerted effort on the part of scientists and practitioners to use scientific techniques in evaluating alternative action policies.

Lately there seems to have been a reduction in this latter type of work, which is reflected in the relative scarcity of research directly related to action techniques among the Fellowship reports. The exceptions are far more theoretically oriented than earlier action studies, despite their practical emphasis. Were it not for the reduction in "action research" within intergroup agencies, the concomitant relative absence of action research among the Fellowship reports might simply reflect the administration of the Fellowships through university social science departments and the general lack of status of applied research in university life.

The decrease in action research may be due to a reduction in the finances of action agencies, or to some degree of disillusionment with the value of such work following an initial enthusiasm. It might also reflect an awareness, based upon experience, of the grave difficulties involved in attempting to apply general social science principles and research methods to concrete problems, because of the ambiguity of much social science knowledge. This, in turn, may be leading to an enhanced recognition of the need for increased fundamental knowledge of human behavior for the purposes of developing effective programs of action. In this view, all intelligent research is "action research," as long as it contributes to our understanding of the determinants of human relations.

Thus, Kornhauser's study of the bases of union race policies is not "action research" in the simple sense of a test of the effectiveness of some techniques of social change. It does, however, provide us with increased sophistication in our understanding of its subject and

should significantly, if subtly, have important repercussions on strategy in its field.

Although the increase in fundamental social science research is largely to the good, the diminution of action research of the traditional kind holds some dangers for intergroup action and for social science. The universities are correctly seen as the appropriate agencies for the promotion of fundamental knowledge, but as research activities are transferred from agency office to campus, the contact between researchers and practitioners tends to become more tenuous. Written reports and formal conferences cannot substitute for the value of daily contact and collaboration in communicating the practitioner's clinical insights or the scientist's research findings. If intergroup research is to center more and more in the universities, it would be well to give serious consideration to methods of establishing closer collaboration between those charged with making action policies and those conducting research, beyond the limited contacts attendant upon the financing of research and occasional consultations.

Scientifically, the most serious problem faced by future research seems to be the continued disparity between the "psychological" and the "sociological" approaches to the field. For each specialist to continue to push forward the frontiers of his own particular subject would hardly be sufficient. Somewhere the two must meet, for in any dynamic setting both types of factors undoubtedly operate. Only if the nature of the authoritarian personality and of the institutional setting in which that personality operates are both understood can the actual intergroup behavior of authoritarian people be adequately understood. Collaboration and communication between psychology and sociology is nevertheless sometimes difficult.

A sociologist with a psychological background, Samuel A. Stouffer, has pointed up the inadequacies of current conceptions of prejudice by recently showing how a liberal eastern college professor can be just as rigidly prejudiced as the most bigoted racist, merely by unthinkingly accepting the catchwords of his own cultural sub-group.[83]

Cultural anthropology, straddling psychological and sociological approaches to social behavior, is in a unique position to combine these two approaches in the study of problems of human relations.[84] For the most part, anthropologists have contented themselves with general statements about race and race mixtures rather than going on to more specific research.

---

83. Samuel A. Stouffer, at the National Conference on Human Relations Education, Hotel Commodore, New York, April 29, 1955. His presentation appears in *Current Problems and Issues in Human Relations Education*, New York, 1955, pp. 7-12.

84. Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, *The Mark of Oppression*, New York, 1951, is an example of the use of psychodynamic insights against a backdrop of sociological knowledge. Kardiner has studied a variety of culture-personality situations in order to examine the interrelations between the variables of culture and personality. See Kardiner *et al.*, *The Individual and His Society*, New York, 1939, and *The Psychological Frontiers of Society*, New York, 1945, for his use of the adaptational frame of reference. Kardiner's work adumbrated much later research and represents perhaps the most considerable body of knowledge on personality in culture, as seen from an interdisciplinary viewpoint.

Victor Goldkind, a Livingston Fellow, used anthropological materials to study ethnocentrism.[85] He took twenty-five societies at random from the Yale Human Relations Area Files, a collection of all published anthropological material, to study the genesis and dynamics of ethnocentrism. Goldkind analysed these anthropological materials in order to relate ethnocentrism to other cultural and psychological phenomena. This kind of detailed analysis, using modern statistical techniques on anthropological materials, deserves further exploration. It can lead to the kind of significant generalizations developed in studies like Murdock's *Social Structure*.[86]

Disciplines such as social psychology also lay claim to covering both the psychological and sociological approaches. To date, however, after the initial spurt of enthusiasm for the possible achievements of group dynamics, public opinion studies, and the other new emphases of social psychology, there has been a feeling that perhaps too much was originally expected of social psychology, in spite of its tremendous advances in the last few decades.[87]

To illustrate some possible approaches to a *rapprochement* between psychological and sociological approaches to prejudice and discrimination, we conclude with a list of some questions and hypotheses. Some of these have been directly posed by the Sigmund Livingston Fellows; others are derived from different research and the general theory of social psychology.

1. Is the problem of the interrelations of prejudices toward various minorities exhausted by the simple choice between a generalized ethnocentrism and completely unrelated attitudes toward various groups? Ortmeyer's study indicates that a factor analysis of the problem shows both a generalized prejudice factor and a series of quite different prejudices toward different groups. This suggests that personality factors might predispose individuals to hostility toward out-groups while the culture presents the situational definitions which determine the out-groups selected and the different *styles* of prejudice appropriate for each. This point has been made in general theoretical terms before, but little interdisciplinary research has been conducted along these lines. Ortmeyer's results suggest that prejudice, like Spearman's concept of intelligence, has both a generalized and specific component.

2. Once we have established that certain personality patterns predispose individuals to ethnic hostility, one next step is to investi-

85. Victor Goldkind (Sigmund Livingston Fellow, Yale University, 1950-51), "Ethnocentrism: A Cross-Cultural Study," Report to the Department of Anthropology, Yale University.

86. George P. Murdock, *Social Structure*, New York, 1950, is an impressively successful attempt to apply modern statistical techniques to anthropological data in order to develop meaningful generalizations about society.

87. An outstanding example of mature social psychology at its best is Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, Harold H. Kelley, *Communication and Persuasion*, New Haven, 1953. This book is a sophisticated discussion of a program of research on communications which has action implications of considerable immediacy, for anyone interested in the modifiability of opinions and attitudes. G. Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Boston, 1954, is the most comprehensive explication of social psychology today.

gate the cause of the prejudiced personality patterns. This leads to the border-line between psychology and sociology, in which experience in the institutions of society is analyzed in an effort to discern the influence of various social positions and experiences in the development or the maintenance of personality and character. The developing field of personality and culture studies — of personality *in* culture — has the greatest potential for contributing to an integrated psychological and sociological analysis of intergroup relations.

3. From several studies, it appears evident that the manifestation of personality in overt behavior is not a simple mechanical unfolding, but depends largely on the situation in which action is to occur. Robb, in his participant-observer study of anti-Semites in the London borough of Bethnal Green, has reported that anti-Semites are deviant persons who yet have a need to conform to group norms, and that this approach is a possible fruitful blending of the personality and the group approach.[88] Developments in role theory may help our understanding of the person in the situation.

Swanson's research shows how the same action may often be expected of diametrically opposite personalities, while opposite actions can often be observed by the same personality under different social conditions. For example, a "conformist" might well manifest prejudice by the use of invective against a minority when he perceives that this would be approved by his associates, while in a situation in which it would be disapproved, his conformism would lead him to avoid such references. This kind of "sociological" element must be considered in the evaluation of personality determinants. Among the more important determinants of the group atmosphere which Swanson found so crucial in determining the effect of personality is the institutional structure of the society. Among the more important determinants of the climate of opinion which determines whether a conformist will exhibit prejudice or tolerance is the culture. Merton's study emphasizes the importance of the subculture to which a person belongs in shaping his role behavior.

4. The theory of reference group behavior gives promise of providing a unified approach to the interrelations of group identification, attitudes, and associations with other people. Here again, however, we find that the most crucial unsolved problems lie on the borderline of the group and the individual approaches. Why does a "marginal" individual choose one group rather than another for his primary identification? Why does one group of associates have more influence over the individual's attitudes than another group? Answers to such questions might be found in part in the different functional values of different groups and their ideologies for different personalities.

---

88. James H. Robb, *Working-Class Anti-Semite: A Psychological Study in A London Borough*. London, 1954, is one of the most enterprisingly designed attempts to show how early childhood personality factors later unfold in a social situation.

In brief, we have found social science recently making great strides in advancing our understanding of the personality factors associated with prejudice on the one hand, and of the institutional, cultural, and group factors in the development of attitudes and manifestations of discrimination and hostility on the other. Some work has been done toward the integration of the two types of findings. The most exciting possibilities for the future lie in further work along these lines.

CHAPTER VII

The Livingston Fellowships

(BY SUBJECT)

The range of studies undertaken by Livingston Fellows is indicated below:

A. Discrimination: its causes and effects ..... 7 projects
- Within the professions — 2 projects
- Within labor unions — 2 projects
- In housing — 2 projects
- In college fraternities — 1 project

B. Community and/or agency programs ..... 9 projects
- Education — 5 projects
- Intergroup action agencies — 2 projects
- Mass media — 1 project
- Community participation — 1 project

C. Community attitude surveys ..... 2 projects

D. The psychology and/or sociology of attitude formation ..... 7 projects

E. The psychology and/or sociology of attitude change ..... 5 projects

F. Minority group community structure and attitudes ..... 5 projects
- Japanese-Americans — 1 project
- Negroes — 1 project
- Mexican Americans — 1 project
- American Indians — 1 project
- Interminority attitudes — 1 project

G. Minority individuals and their adjustment problems ..... 4 projects
- Jewish youth — 3 projects
- Negro youth — 1 project

H. Research methods in the intergroup relations field ..... 2 projects

I. Study of voting behavior ..... 1 project

Total: 42 projects

THE LIVINGSTON FELLOWS

Brandeis University

Dr. Lawrence H. Fuchs (1953-1954)	American Jews and the presidential vote.

Boston University

Lawrence Schlesinger (1950-1951)	The influence of exposure to peer group opinions on the expression of attitudes toward a minority group.

University of California

Scott Greer (1949-1950-1951)	A study of ethnic group participation in labor unions in Southern California.

University of Chicago

Charles Bonner (1947-1948)	A survey and evaluation of intercultural education programs in Gary, Indiana.
Marie Fielder (1947-1948)	An analysis of intercultural education programs in Los Angeles.
Morris Haimowitz (1947-1948)	A study of the use of psychotherapy in treating prejudice.
Ruth Palter (1947-1948)	Development of an instrument to measure levels of intergroup tension.
Judith Roothaan (1948-1949)	A study of the attitudes of one minority toward another.
Lewis Killian (1948-1949)	A study of the adjustment of Southern white migrants in Chicago.
John Lassoe, Jr. (1948-1949)	A study of methods of financing local private intergroup relations agencies.
Dietrich Reitzes (1948-1949)	A study of the influence of community organization on the intergroup behavior of their members.
Egbert Scheitinger (1948-1949)	An investigation of racial succession and changing property values in residential Chicago.
Helen Amerman (1949-1950)	The impact of intergroup relations on non-segregated urban public education.
Rhoda Goldstein (1949-1950)	A survey of minority group practices of national professional associations.
William Kornhauser (1949-1950)	An analysis of labor union policies in race relations.
Bernard Lazerwitz (1950-1951)	An investigation of some factors in the self-identification of Jews.

Columbia University

Dr. Marie Jahoda Mrs. Davenport West (1949-1950)	An investigation of the effects of an interracial housing situation on the intergroup attitudes and adjustments of its residents.
Wagner Thielens, Jr. (1950-1951)	A study of the effectiveness of a mass medium carrying an intergroup message.

Cornell University

Gloria May (1949-1950)	A study of the interests, behavior, and attitudes of Negro youth in Elmira, New York.
Bernard Rosen (1950-1951)	An analysis of the development and change of religious beliefs and practices among Jewish adolescents.

University of Denver

Donn O'Meara (1948-1949)	An evaluation of a university curriculum on intergroup relations.

Fisk University

Dr. Edna Masuoka (1949-1950)	A survey of the racial attitudes and opinions of prominent white Southerners who have migrated from the South.

Harvard University

Gardner Lindzey (1947-1948)	A study of psychological mechanisms involved in prejudice.
Ozzie Simmons (1947-1948)	Field research in prejudice and conflict as represented in Mexican-white relations in the Southwest.
Harold Garfinkel (1948-1949)	A study of the role of stereotypes in interpersonal relationships.
Jacob Getzels (1948-1949)	The application of equated direct and projective questionnaires to the investigation of prejudice.
Bernard Kutner (1949-1950)	A study of patterns of mental functioning associated with prejudice in children.
Kaspar Naegele (1949-1950)	An investigation of some aspects of hostility and aggression in middle class families.
Nathan Kogan (1950-1951)	A study of the influence of prejudice on perception of minority group members.

Iowa State College

Norman Cleary (1950-1951)	An investigation of the intergroup attitudes of high school youth in a rural county in the Midwest.

University of Michigan

Dr. G. E. Swanson (1948-1949)	Some effects of member object-relationships on small groups.
Andrew Kapos (1949-1950)	A study of the intergroup attitudes of fraternity men as related to the group standard.
James Lau (1950-1951)	The development and testing of a technique to change discriminatory attitudes and practices in fraternities.

New York University

Henry Haskell (1947-1948)	A study of the effect of day care center experience on the personalities of first grade children.
Dr. Dan Dodson (1948-1949)	A survey of some of the activities of the New York Mayor's Committee on Unity.
Lawrence Park (1949-1950)	An investigation of the relationship of emotional needs to prejudice in children.

University of Washington

Keith Griffiths Gordon Hirabayashi (1949-1950)	Development of an instrument to assess relations within a community.

Yale University

Victor Goldkind (1950-1951)	A study of the dynamics of ethnocentrism through analysis of anthropological data on patterns of behavior through outgroups.

THE SIGMUND LIVINGSTON MEMORIAL FUND

The officers of the Fund are:

President	HILDA LIVINGSTON
Secretary	BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN
Treasurer	JACOB ALSON

The directors of the Fund are:

HILDA LIVINGSTON	BERNARD NATH
JACOB ALSON	RICHARD LIVINGSTON
BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN	MAX SCHNEIDER
HON. HENRY EPSTEIN	HENRY E. SCHULTZ
HAROLD LACHMAN	

The purposes of the Fund are outlined in the By Laws as follows:

"The purposes of the corporation are to make gifts to colleges, universities, and other educational institutions exempt from United States federal income tax, to be used by such institutions for furthering by fellowships and otherwise scientific studies in the fields of intergroup and human relations and prejudice.

No part of the net earnings of this corporation shall inure to the benefit of any member or other individual. None of the property of the corporation shall be distributed directly or indirectly to any member of the corporation. In the event of the dissolution or liquidation of the corporation any assets at such time remaining undistributed shall be distributed to and among such organizations of the type hereinabove described as the directors may in their discretion determine.

The corporation shall not carry on propaganda or otherwise attempt to influence legislation."

Index

Adorno, Theodore W. — 15 fn, 24, 26 fn
Allport, Gordon — 14, 14 fn, 32, 32 fn
Amerman, Helen E. — 34, 34 fn, 43

Bean, R. B. — 12 fn
Bernard, L. L. — 12, 12 fn
Block, Jack — 26 fn
Block, Jeanne — 26 fn
Bogardus, Emory S. — 13, 13 fn
Bonner, Charles — 43
Braly, Kenneth W. — 13 fn
Brigham, C. C. — 12, 12 fn
Burgess, Ernest W. — 11 fn

Calverton, Victor F. — 11 fn
Carter, Launor F. — 33 fn
Cayton, Horace R. — 31, 31 fn
Chave, E. J. — 13
Christie, Richard — 24 fn
Clearey, Norman — 44
Cooley, Charles H. — 11

Davis, Allison — 31, 31 fn
Davis, Kingsley — 16, 16 fn
Dodson, Dan — 45
Dollard, John — 14 fn, 15 fn
Drake, St. Clair — 31, 31 fn

Efron, D. — 33 fn

Fielder, Marie — 43
Flowerman, Samuel H. — 13 fn
Foley, J. P., Jr. — 33 fn
Frenkel-Brunswik, Else — 24, 26, 26 fn
Freud, Sigmund — 15 , 19
Fromm, Erich — 24, 24 fn
Fuchs, Lawrence H. — 31, 31 fn, 32, 43

Gardner, Burleigh B. — 31, 31 fn
Gardner, Mary — 31, 31 fn
Garfinkel, Harold — 44
Garfinkel, Rosalynd S. — 36, 36 fn
Getzels, Jacob W. — 21, 21 fn, 44
Giddings, Franklin H. — 11, 11 fn
Goldkind, Victor — 39, 39 fn, 45
Goldstein, Rhoda — 43
Goode, William J. — 22
Greer, Scott — 34, 34 fn, 43
Grice, H. H. — 13 fn
Griffiths, Keith S. — 30, 30 fn, 32, 32 fn, 45

Haimowitz, Morris L. — 27, 27 fn, 43
Haimowitz, Natalie — 27 fn
Hartley, Eugene — 24 fn, 25 fn, 33 fn
Haskell, Henry S. — 20, 20 fn, 27, 28, 45
Hirabayashi, Gordon — 30, 30 fn, 32, 45
Horowitz, Eugene L. — 14 fn
Hovland, Carl I. — 39 fn
Huntington, Mary Jean — 22

Jahoda, Marie — 13 fn, 21, 24 fn, 44
Janis, Irving L. — 39 fn
Johnson, Robert B. — 23, 23 fn

Kapos, Andrew — 25 fn, 35, 35 fn, 45
Kardiner, Abram — 38 fn
Katz, Daniel — 13 fn
Kelley, Harold H. — 39 fn
Killian, Lewis M. — 19, 19 fn, 30, 30 fn, 43
Kogan, Nathan — 44
Kornhauser, William — 34, 34 fn, 35, 37, 43
Kramer, Bernard M. — 14 fn
Kroeber, Alfred L. — 16, 16 fn
Kutner, Bernard — 18, 18 fn, 25, 25 fn, 26, 27, 44

Lassoe, John, Jr. — 43
Lau, James — 45
Lazarsfeld, Paul F. — 16 fn
Lazerwitz, Bernard — 35, 35 fn, 43
Levinson, Daniel — 24
Lewin, Kurt — 15, 16
Likert, Rensis — 13, 13 fn, 24 fn, 25 fn
Lindzey, Gardner — 15, 15 fn, 25 fn, 33, 33 fn, 39 fn, 44
Lippman, Walter — 14, 14 fn
Lohman, Joseph D. — 33 fn

MacDougall, William — 11, 11 fn
Mall, F. P. — 12 fn
Maslow, Abraham H. — 15, 15 fn, 24 fn
Masuoka, Edna Cooper — 31, 31 fn, 44

May, Gloria — 31, 31 fn, 44
Mead, George Herbert — 11, 11 fn
Merton, Robert K. — 16 fn, 21, 21 fn, 22, 40
Moore, H. E. — 31 fn
Morris, Charles W. — 11 fn
Murdock, George P. — 39, 39 fn
Murphy, Gardner — 14 fn, 16 fn, 24 fn, 25 fn
Murphy, Lois — 14 fn
Myrdal, Gunnar — 11 fn

Naegele, Kaspar — 20, 20 fn, 27, 34, 34 fn, 44
Newcomb, Theodore M. — 14 fn, 33 fn, 35 fn

Odum, Howard — 12, 12 fn, 31 fn
Ogburn, William F. — 12 fn
O'Meara, Donn — 44
Ortmeyer, Carl E. — 20, 20 fn, 25, 25 fn, 39
Ovesey, Lionel — 38 fn

Palter, Ruth — 43
Park, Lawrence — 27, 27 fn
Park, Robert E. — 11, 11 fn, 45
Parsons, Talcott — 32 fn
Patrick, J. R. — 13 fn

Reitzes, Dietrich C. — 33, 33 fn, 35, 43
Remmers, H. H. — 13, 13 fn
Riecken, Henry W. — 22, 23 fn
Robb, James H. — 40, 40 fn
Rogers, Carl R. — 27 fn, 28
Rogolsky, Saul — 25 fn, 33 fn
Rokeach, Milton — 24, 26, 26 fn, 27
Roothann, Judith — 43
Rose, Arnold M. — 13 fn, 14 fn
Rosen, Bernard — 19, 19 fn, 35, 35 fn, 44

Sanford, R. Nevitt — 24, 26 fn
Schietinger, E. F. — 35, 35 fn, 43
Schlesinger, Lawrence E. — 20, 20 fn, 43
Seeleman, V. — 33 fn
Shapiro, Gilbert — 5, 6
Sherif, Muzafer — 35 fn
Shils, Edward A. — 32 fn
Silance, E. B. — 13 fn
Simmons, Ozzie — 19, 19 fn, 30, 30 fn, 44
Sims, V. M. — 13 fn
Smith, F. Tredwell — 14 fn
Spenser, Robert F. — 16 fn
Srole, Leo — 31 fn
Sumner, William G. — 11 fn
Stouffer, Samuel A. — 16 fn, 38, 38 fn
Swanson, G. E. — 19, 19 fn, 20, 28, 28 fn, 29, 40, 45

Thielens, Wagner, Jr. — 44
Thurstone, L. L. — 13, 13 fn, 14, 14 fn

Warner, W. Lloyd — 31 fn
Watson, Jeanne — 28 fn
West, Patricia S. — 21, 44
Williams, Robin M., Jr. — 7, 14, 14 fn
Winick, Charles — 5, 6

Zawadski, B. — 15 fn